

BRIEF

NOTES

Upon a late

SERMON,

TITLED,

The Fear of God and the King;

Preachd, and since Publishd, By

MATTHEW GRIFFITH, D.D.

And Chaplain to the late KING.

Wherin many Notorious Wrestings of Scripture,
and other Falsities are observd by *F.M.*



L O N D O N,

Printed in the Year 1660.

NOTES

SERMON

THE POWER OF GOD AND THE KING
PREACHED AND FIRST PUBLISHED BY
MATTHEW CRISTIAN D.D.
Pastor of the Church of St. Andrew

Various many Sermons Written of Sermons
and other Sermons collected by W.M.



LONDON

Printed in the Year 1660

(2)
ler, open'd his pack of ware before the Kid; though
he now would seem to personate the good Samaritan,
undertaking to describe the rise and progress of our na-
tional malady, and to prescribe the onely remedy:
which how he performs, we shall quickly see.

First, he would suborn Saint Luke as his spokesman
to the General, presuming, it seems, to have had as
perfect understanding of things from the very first, as
the Evangelist had of his Gospel; that the General who
hath so eminently born his part in the whole action,
might know the certainty of those things better from
him a partial Sequester'd enemy: for so he presently
appears, though covertly and like the tempter, com-
mencing his address with an impudent calumnie
and affront to his Excellence, that he would
be pleas'd to carry on what he had so happily begun in the
name and cause not of God onely, which we doubt
not, but of his anointed, meaning the late Kings son:
which is to charge him most audaciously and falsly
with the renouncing of his own public promises
and declarations both to the Parliament and the Ar-
my, and we trust his actions ere long will deter such
insinuating slanderers from thus approaching him
for the future. But the General may well excuse
him; for the Comforter himself escapes not his pre-
sumption, avouch'd as falsly, to have impowrd to
those designs him and him only, who hath solemnly
declar'd the contrary. What Phanatique against
whom he so often inveighs, could more presumptu-
ously affirm whom the Comforter hath impowrd,
then this Antifanatic, as he would be thought to

The

Similiter etiam vult. The Text.

10 Prov. 24. 11. *My son, fear God and the King, and meddle not with them that be seditious, or desirous of change, &c.*

Letting pass matters not in controversie, I come to the main drift of your Sermon, *the King*; which word here is either to signifie any supreme Magistrate, or else your latter object of fear is not universal, belongs not at all to many parts of Christendom, that have no King; and in particular, not to us. That we have no King since the putting down of Kingship in this Commonwealth, is manifest by this last Parliament, who to the time of thir dissolving not onely made no address at all to any King, but summond this next to come by the Writ formerly appointed of a free Commonwealth, without restitution or the least mention of any Kingly right or power; which could not be, if there were at present any King of *England*. The main part therefore of your Sermon, if it mean a King in the usual sense, is either impertinent and absurd, exhorting your auditory to fear that which is not, or if King here be, as it is, understood for any supreme Magistrate, by your own exhortation they are in the first place not to meddle with you, as being your self most of all the *seditious* meant here, and the *desirous of change*, in stirring them up to fear a King, whom the present Government takes no notice of.

You begin with a vain vision, *God and the King at the first blush* (which will not be your last blush) *seeming to stand in your text like those two Cherubims on the*
mercy-

(4)
mercy-seat, looking on each other. By this similitude, your conceited Sanctuary, worse then the Altar of *Abaç*, pattern'd from *Damascus*, degrades God to a Cherub, and raises your King to be his collateral in place, notwithstanding the other differences you put: which well agrees with the Court-letters, lately published from this Lord to tother Lord, that cry him up for no less then Angelical and Celestial.

Your first observation, pag. 8. is, *That God and the King are coupl'd in the text, and what the Holy Ghost hath thus firmly combin'd, we may not, we must not dare to put asunder*; and your self is the first man who puts them asunder by the first proof of your doctrine immediately following, *Judg. 7. 20.* which couples the sword of the Lord and *Gideon*, a man who not only was no King, but refus'd to be a King or Monarch, when it was offer'd him, in the very next chapter, *vers. 22, 23.* *I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you; the Lord shall rule over you.* Here we see that this worthy heroic deliverer of his Country thought it best govern'd, if the Lord govern'd it in that form of a free Commonwealth, which they then enjoin'd without a single person. And this is your first Scripture, abus'd and most impertinently cited, nay against your self, to prove that *Kings at thir Coronation have a sword given them, which you interpret the Militia, the power of life and death put into thir hands*, against the declar'd judgement of our Parliaments, nay of all our Laws, which reserve to themselves only the power of life and death, and render you in thir just resentment

ment of this boldness; another Doctor *Maim-
ring*. He is from 22. *Exon* act. 1. and *John* 1. 19.

Your next proof is as false and frivolous, *The King*,
say you, is *Gods sword-bearer*; true, but not the King
only, for *Gideon* by whom you seek to prove this,
neither was, nor would be a King; and as you your
self confels, pag. 40. *there be divers forms of govern-
ments. He bears not the sword in vain*, Rom. 13. 4. this
also is as true of any lawful rulers, especially su-
preme, so that *rulers*, vers. 3. and therefor this pre-
sent government, without whose authority you ex-
cite the people to a King, bear the sword as well as
Kings, and as little in vain. *They fight against God,*
who resist his Ordinance, and go about to wrest the sword
out of the hands of his Anointed. This is likewise gran-
ted: but who is *his Anointed*? not every King, but
they only who were anointed or made Kings by his
special command, as *Saul*, *David*, and his race,
which ended in the Messiah, (from whom no Kings
at this day can derive thir title) *Isho*, *Cyrus*, and if
any other were by name appointed by him to some
particular service: as for the rest of Kings, all other
supreme Magistrates are as much the Lords anointed
as they, and our obedience commanded equally to
them all, *For there is no power but of God*, Rom. 13. 1.
and we are exhorted in the Gospell to obey Kings,
as other Magistrates, not that they are call'd any
where the Lord's anointed, but as they are *the ordi-
naries of man*, 1 Pet. 2. 13. You therefor and other
such false Doctors, preaching Kings to your auditory,
as the Lord's only anointed, to withdraw people
from the present Government, by your ow n text are
self

self-condemnd, and not to be followed, not to be
medl'd with, but to be noted, as most of all others
the seditions and desirous of change.

Your third proof is no less against your self. *Psal.*
105. 15. touch not mine anointed. For this is not spo-
ken in behalf of Kings, but spoken to reprove Kings,
that they should not touch his anointed Saints and
Servants, the seed of *Abraham*, as the verie next be-
fore might have taught you: he reprov'd Kings for
their sakes, saying, *touch not mine anointed, and do my*
prophets no harm, according to that *1 Cor. 12. 8.* He
who hath anointed us, is God. But how well you con-
firm one wrested Scripture with another: *1 Sam. 8. 7.*
They have not rejected thee, but me: grossly misapply-
ing these words, which were not spoken to any who
had resisted or rejected a King, but to them who much
against the will of God had sought a King, and re-
jected a Commonwealth, wherein they might have
liv'd happily under the Raig'n of God only, this King.
Let the words interpret themselves: *v. 6. 7.* *But the*
thing displeased Samuel, when they said, give us a King
to judge us: and Samuel prayed unto the Lord. And the
Lord said unto Samuel, hearken unto the voice of the
people in all that they say unto thee: for they have not re-
jected thee, but they have rejected me, that I should not
reign over them. Hence you conclude, so indissoluble
is the Conjunction of God and the King. O notori-
ous abuse of Scripture! whereas you should have
concluded, So unwilling was God to give them a
King, So wide was the disjunction of God from a
King. Is this the doctrine you boast of to be
clear in self, and like a Mathematical principle, that
needs

needs no farther demonstration. Bad Logic, bad Mathematics (for principles can have no demonstration at all) but worse Divinitie. O people of an implicit faith no better then *Romish*, if these be thy prime teachers, who to thir credulous audience dare thus juggle with Scripture, to alleage those places for the proof of thir doctrine, which are the plane refutation: and this is all the Scripture which he brings to confirm his point.

The rest of his preachment is meer groundless chat, save heer and there a few granes of corn scatterd to intice the silly fowl into his net, interlac't heer and there with som human reading; though slight, and notwithstanding Geographical and Historical mistakes: as page 29, *Suevia* the German dukedom, for *Suecia* the Northern Kingdom: *Philip of Macedon*, who is generally understood of the great *Alexanders* father only, made contemporarie, page 31, with *T. Quintus* the Roman commander, instead of *T. Quintus* and the latter *Philips*; and page 44, *Tully* cited in his third oration against *Ferres*, to say of him, *that he was a wicked Consul*, who never was a Consul: nor Trojan sedition ever perur'd by that verse of *Virgil*, which you cite page 47, as *that of Troy*. school-boys could have told you, that ther is nothing of *Troy* in that whole portraiture, as you call it, of *sedition*. These gross mistakes may justly bring in doubt your other loose citations; and that you take them up somewhere at the second or third hand rashly and without due considering.

Not are you happier in the relating or the moralizing your fable. *The frogs* (being once a free Nation

tion saith the fable) petitioned Jupiter for a King: he
tumbld among them a log. They found it insensible: they
petitioned then for a King that should be answer: he sent
them a Crane (a Stork saith the fable) which straight
fell to pecking them up. This you apply to the reproof
of them who desire change: whereas indeed the true
moral shews rather the folly of those, who being free
seek a King; which for the most part either as a log
lies heaue on his Subjects, without doing aught wor-
thie of his dignitie and the charge to maintain him,
or as a Stork is ever pecking them up and devouring
them.

But by our fundamental Laws, the King is the highest
power, page 40. If we must hear mooring and law-
lectures from the Pulpit, what shame is it for a Dr. of
Divinitie, not first to consider, that no law can be
fundamental, but that which is grounded on the light
of nature or right reason, commonly call'd moral law:
which no form of Government was ever counted; but
arbitrarie, and at all times in the choice of every free
people, or thir representers. This choice of Govern-
ment is so essential to thir freedom, that longer then
they have it, they are not free. In this land not only
the late King and his posteritie, but kingship it self
hath bin abrogated by a law, which involves with as
good reason the posteritie of a King forfeited to the
people, as that Law heretofore of Treason against the
King, attainted the children with the father. This
Law against both King and Kingship they who most
question, do no less question all enacted without the
King and his Antiparlament at Oxford, though call'd
Mungrell by himself. If no Law must be held good,
but

but what passes in full Parliament, then surely in exactness of legalitie, no member must be missing: for look how many are missing, so many Counties or Cities that sent them, want thir representers. But if being once chosen, they serve for the whole Nation, then any number which is sufficient, is full, and most of all in times of discord, necessitie and danger. The King himself was bound by the old Mode of Parliaments, not to be absent, but in case of sickness; or some extraordinary occasion, and then to leave his substitute, much less might any member be allowd to absent himself. If the King then and many of the members with him, without leaving any in his stead, forsook the Parliament upon a meer panic fear, as was at that time judg'd by most men, and to leave Warr against them that far, should they who were left sitting, break up, or not dare enact aught of neereft and presentest concernment to public safety, for the punctilio wanting of a full number, which no Law book in such extraordinary cases hath determind? Certainly if it were lawfull for them to fly from thir charge upon pretence of privat safety, it was much more lawfull for these to sit and act in thir trust what was necessary for public. By a Law therefor of Parliament, and of a Parliament that conquerd both *Ireland, Scotland,* & all thir enemies in *England*, defended thir friends, were generally acknowledgd for a Parliament both at home & abroad, kingship was abolishd: this Law now of late hath bin negatively repeald, yet Kingship not positively restor'd, and I suppose never was establishd by any certain Law in this Land, nor possibly could be: for how could our forefathers binde

as to any certain form of Government, more then we
can binde our posteritie? If a people be put to warre
with thir King for his misgovernment, and overcome
him, the power is then undoubtedly in thir own
hands how they will be governd. The warr was gran-
ted *just* by the King himself at the beginning of his
last treatie, and still maintaind to be so by this last
Parlament, as appears by the qualification prescrib'd
to the members of this next ensuing. That none shall
be elected, who have born arms against the Parla-
ment since 1641. If the warr were *just*, the con-
quest was also *just* by the Law of Nations. And he
who was the chief enemie, in all right ceas'd to be the
King, especially after captivitie, by the deciding ver-
dict of warr, and royaltie with all her Laws and pre-
tentions, yet remains in the victors power, together
with the choice of our future Government. Free
Commonwealths have bin ever counted fittest and
properest for civil, vertuous and industrious Nations,
abounding with prudent men worthie to govern :
monarchie fittest to curb degenerate, corrupt, idle,
proud, luxurious people. If we desire to be of the
former, nothing better for us, nothing nobler
then a free Commonwealth: if we will needs con-
demn our selves to be of the latter, despairing of our
own vertue, industrie and the number of our able
men, we may then, conscious of our own unwor-
thiness to be governd better, sadly betake us to our
befitting thralldom: yet chusing out of our own num-
ber one who hath best aided the people, and best me-
rited against tyrannie, the space of a raigh or two we
may chance to live happily enough, or tolerably. But
that

that a victorious people should give up themselves again to the vanquishd, was never yet heard of; seems rather void of all reason and good policie, and will in all probabilitie subject the subduers to the subdu'd, will expose to revenge, to beggarie, to ruin and perpetual bondage the victors under the vanquishd: then which what can be more unworthie?

From misinterpreting our Law, you return to do again the same with Scripture; and would prove the supremacy of *English Kings* from 1 Pet. 2. 13. as if that were the Apostles work: wherein if he saith that *the king is supreme*, he speaks so of him but as an ordinance of man, and in respect of those *Governours that are sent by him*, not in respect of Parlements, which by the Law of this Land are his bridle; in vain his bridle, if not also his rider: and therefor hath not only coordination with him, which you falsely call *sedition*, but hath superiority above him, and that neither *against religion*, nor *right reason*: no nor against Common Law; for our Kings reignd only by Law: but the Parliament is above all positive Law, whether civil or common, makes or unmakes them both, & still the latter Parliament above the former, above all the former Lawgivers, then certainly above all precedent Laws, entaild the Crown on whom it pleasd; and, as a great Lawyer saith, *is so transcendent and absolute, that it cannot be confin'd either for causes or persons, within any bounds.* But your cry is, no Parliament without a King. If this be so, we have never had lawfull Kings, who have all bin created Kings either by such Parlements, or by conquest: if by such Parlements, they are in your allowance none: if by conquest, that conquest

we have now conquered. So that as well by your own assertion as by ours, there can at present be no King. And how could that person be absolutely supreme, who reignd, not under Law only, but under oath of his good demeanour given to the people at his coronation, ere the people gave him his Crown: and his principal oath was to maintain those Laws which the people should chuse? If then the Law it self, much more he who was but the keeper and minister of Law, was in thir choice; and both he subordinat to the performance of his duty sworn, and our sworn allegiance in order only to his performance.

You fall next on the *Consistorian Schismatics*; for so you call Presbyterians, page 40; and judge them to have *enervated the Kings Supremacie by thir opinions and practice, differing in many things only in terms from Poperie*; though some of those principles which you there cite concerning Kingship, are to be read in *Aristotiles Politics*, long ere Popery was thought on. The Presbyterians therefor it concerns to be well forewarnd of you betimes; and to them I leave you.

As for your examples of seditious men, page 54, &c. *Cora, Absalom, Zimri, Sheba*, to these you might with much more reason have added your own name, who *blow the Trumpet of sedition* from your Pulpit against the present Government: in reward wherof they have sent you by this time, as I hear, *to your own place*, for preaching open sedition, while you would seem to preach against it.

As for your appendix annext of the *Samaritan revived*, finding it so foul a libell against all the well-affected of this land, since the very time of *Ship-mo-ney*,

ney, against the whole Parliament, both Lords and Commons, except those that fled to *Oxford*, against the whole reformed Church, not only in *England* and *Scotland*, but all over *Europ* (in comparison whereof you and your Prelatical partie are more truly schismatics and sectarians, nay more properly *fanatics* in your *fanes* and gilded temples, then those whom you revile by those names) and meeting with no more Scripture or solid reason in your *Samaritan* wine and oyle, then hath already bin found sophisticated and adulterate, I leave your malignant narrative, as needing no other confutation, then the just censure already pass'd upon you by the Councel of State.
